

Application Serial No. 09/835,311
Amendment Dated October 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed June 16, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3 and 5-14 are pending in the Application. As set forth more fully below, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections of the claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,766,163 (hereinafter "Sharma"). Applicants have amended Claim 1 to incorporate a limitation of Claim 6. As noted by the Examiner at page 7 of the Office Action having a mailing date of June 16, 2005, "Sharma does not teach . . . a workflow engine for handling the process of approval of publishing of the digital contents on the corresponding media" Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 1-3 and 13-14, as amended, are not anticipated by Sharma and request that the Examiner's rejections under 35 USC § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4-7 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sharma in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0080170 (hereinafter "Goldberg").

As noted above, Sharma does not does not teach a workflow engine for handling the process of approval of publishing of the digital contents on the corresponding media. The Examiner argues that Goldberg teaches such a workflow engine in the form of a "watch unit" described as a unit "operative to watch for a defined unit of information in a flow of information." [0032] This system is further described as identifying elements within information sources [0075], particularly web pages. But this is not the function of the workflow engine within the service layer of the present invention. Instead, the workflow engine of the present invention handles the approval of publishing digital contents on different media. Thus, this feature functions to control the inflow and outflow of digital information as well as its recordation and retrieval from the data layer. In contrast, the "watch unit" of Goldberg performs some of the functions of the personalization service of the present invention, specifically, the identification of

Application Serial No. 09/835,311
Amendment Dated October 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed June 16, 2005


specific data, or subsets of data, identified by specific users to be retained and published to the user in a user-defined format. Thus, the "watch unit" of Goldberg does not perform the same functions as the workflow engine of the present invention and hence, Goldberg does not teach the workflow engine element of the present claims.

For this reason, the combination of Sharma and Goldberg does not teach all of the limitations of Claim 1 and claims dependent therefrom and the rejection of these claims based on this combination of claims should be withdrawn.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By: 
Robert D. Traver
Registration No. 47,999
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200
Denver, Colorado 80202-5141
(303) 863-9700

Date: 12 Oct 2005